

**Answers To Written Questions Submitted To PSTB Regarding  
The Lea County Electric Cooperative RFP**

Beginning on Page 2 of the Project Information Sheet, the PSTB requests responding firms provide costs for a list of items using a number of provided assumptions. Having not as yet reviewed the available investigative information, it is highly probable that the conceptual approach and preliminary system design provided elsewhere in our proposal may be different than the system specified for costing.

**Question 1.** Are we to assume the SVE system is being pre-specified by the PSTB strictly such that cost comparisons between competing firms can be directly made?

**ANSWER 1:** PSTB BELIEVES THAT SVE SYSTEM DESCRIBED IN THE RFP IS A VIABLE REMEDIATION TOOL AT THIS SITE AND, AS SUCH, REQUESTS COSTS TO IMPLEMENT THE COST ITEMS LISTED.

**Question 2.** If a respondent's conceptual design is different than the cost specification, should they also provide costing for their conceptual system?

**ANSWER 2:** YES, AND A JUSTIFICATION FOR ALTERNATE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN SHOULD BE MADE.

The Phase 3 pilot testing specification includes vapor treatment while the Phase 3, 4, and 5 specification for the six well SVE system does not.

**Question 3.** Are we to not include the cost of vapor treatment in that cost item?

**ANSWER 3:** PSTB REQUESTS THAT OFFERORS DESIGN A SYSTEM THAT WILL REMOVE ALL NAPL WITHIN 18 MONTHS AND REDUCE DISSOLVED PHASE BENZENE CONCENTRATIONS TO LESS THAN 100 PPB WITHIN 3 YEARS. IT IS UP TO THE OFFERORS TO DETERMINE WHETHER VAPOR ABATEMENT IS REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE THESE GOALS. IF IT IS REQUIRED, THE COSTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED.

Three of the assumptions pertinent to the "to-be-costed" system are design of the SVE system and components sufficient to; a) removal all NAPL in 18 months, b) move the project to MNA status within 3 years, and c) that MNA can commence once the dissolved-benzene concentration is diminished to 100 ppb in all monitoring wells.

**Question 4.** Assumptions a) and b) would seem to be better described as performance criteria. Is this true?

**ANSWER 4:** YES. THESE ARE THE CRITERIA WE EXPECT TO BE USED IN DESIGNING THE SVE SYSTEM.

In established and accepted SVE design, the desired cleanup timeframe along with verified or estimated vadose zone permeability are used in the development of system capacities (i.e. well diameters, screened intervals, number of vapor wells, manifold sizing, pumping capacity, vapor abatement capacity, etc.). Your RFP fixes the number of vapor wells at six for costing purposes. Various firms may derive different design parameters for the same set of assumptions, which will result in different costs.

**Question 5.** Is this why vapor abatement and utility costs are not to be included in the specified implementation costing?

**ANSWER 5:** THE RFP SPECIFIES ONLY THAT UTILITY COSTS ARE NOT TO BE INCLUDED.

If yes, this would not address the potential difference in drilling, materials, and pump costs.

**Question 6.** If the answer to Question 5 is yes or no, how could valid cost comparisons still be made?

**ANSWER 6:** PROVIDE COSTS FOR THE SYSTEM AS SPECIFIED IN THE RFP; DEFEND THIS SYSTEM OR PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH WITH JUSTIFICATION FOR TECHNICAL MERIT.

The specific proposal scoring criteria for recent RFPs has varied considerably and it has been stated PSTB policy that the criteria for scoring must be approved by Task Force prior to public release of any RFP. Scoring criteria were not provided as part of either the Project Information Sheet or Proposal Specification Package dated August 2006.

**Question 7.** Will the PSTB make available to all interested parties the scoring criteria for this RFP at any reasonable time prior to the deadline for submission of proposals? If not, why should responding firms be required to “guess” the relative importance the PSTB may place on various components of proposals when the effort requires significant expenditure of our resources to respond and then of public monies for the PSTB to evaluate and eventually implement?

**ANSWER 7:** PSTB UTILIZES A STANDARD SCORING PROCEDURE WITH FEW VARIATIONS. FOR THIS RFP:

- Does proposal address source area soil contamination: 100 pts
- Does proposal address groundwater contamination and NAPL: 100 pts
- Understanding of site specific conditions: 250 pts
- Appropriateness of remediation strategy: 200 pts
- Administrative completeness: 50 pts
- Cost effectiveness: 300 pts